



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,446	10/10/2000	Daniel Brown	0544MH-40014	5062

7590 09/20/2002

Christopher W Kennerly Esq  
Baker Botts LLP  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 95201-2980

EXAMINER

WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*Handwritten signature*

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/686,446

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac M Woo

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1–7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,511, hereinafter, "Fisher").

With respect to claim 1, Fisher discloses the system for generating notification messages,

plurality of applications (local events, other event sources and auxiliary server 154, FIG. 8), each application generating event messages (all event notification), see (Fig. 8 and col. 14, lines 26-55);

event router (186, FIG. 8) in communication with the applications, wherein the router receives the event messages, see (FIG. 8, col. 14, lines 55-67 to col. 15, lines 1-4);

alert manager in communication with the router for receiving a selected subset of the event messages (filtering specified objects, specified classes of objects or specified sub-tree of objects), see (col. 14, lines 38-44,); and

plurality of rules within the alert manger, each rule having an associated notification, and each rule registered to act upon selected events within the selected subset of event messages, see (col. 15, lines 4-27);

wherein, upon receiving a message at the alert manager, all rules registered to act upon the message are evaluated (col. 15, lines 4-27), sending the associated notifications, see (FIG. 8, users). Fisher does not explicitly disclose rules that evaluate to True. However, Fisher teaches the matching rule must apply to the "event notification" operation and the targeted grant rule for notification which means the only granted notification (notification passed against the deny rules evaluated as True, FIG. 5, col. 15, lines 13-27) can be forwarded to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Fisher include the step of the rules that evaluate to True. The "True" is to have granted right against deny rule, thus, the system provides the execution rules with access rights or privileges to specific applications that only are evaluated as True. Therefore, it would be beneficial to use granted right for security and filtering the application executions.

With respect to claim 2, Fisher discloses the database having data which can be changed, see (col. 15, lines 42-57, Note: access control tree is one of the database in abstract); and

job that periodically examines the database, and generates an event message when selected data items in the database have changed from a previous examination, see (col. 15, lines 42-57).

With respect to claim 3, Fisher discloses the system for generating notifications, plurality of applications that generates event messages, see (local events, other event sources and auxiliary server 154, FIG. 8, and col. 14, lines 26-55);

router in communication with the application; see (FIG. 8, col. 14, lines 55-67 to col. 15, lines 1-4);

plurality of event handlers in communication with the router, see (FIG. 9, col. 16, lines 14-67 to col. 17, lines 1-67); and

set of rules attached to the router, each rule associated with at least one event message, see (FIG. 5, FIG. 8, col. 15, lines 4-42);

when an event message is received, the associated rules are evaluated, the event message is forwarded to a related handler, see (FIG. 8, and FIG. 9 and col. 15, lines 4-57; col. 16, lines 14-67 to col. 17, lines 67). Fisher does not explicitly disclose for rules that evaluate to True. However, Fisher teaches the matching rule must apply to the "event notification" operation and the targeted grant rule for notification which means the only granted notification (notification passed against the deny rules evaluated as True, FIG. 5, col. 15, lines 13-27) can be forwarded to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Fisher include the step of all rules that evaluate to True. The "True" is to have granted right

against deny rule, thus, the system provide access rights or privileges to specific applications. Therefore, it would be beneficial to use granted right for security and filtering the information.

With respect to claim 4, Fisher discloses the database having data which can be changed, see (col. 15, lines 42-57, Note: access control tree is one of the database in abstract); and

job that periodically examines the database, and generates an event message when selected data items in the database have changed from a pervious examination, see (col. 15, lines 42-57).

With respect to claim 5, Fisher discloses the method for generating notifications, generating an event message within an application, see (local events, other event sources and auxiliary server 154, FIG. 8, and col. 14, lines 26-55);

sending the event message to a router, see (FIG. 8, col. 14, lines 55-67 to col. 15, lines 1-4);

within the router, registering recipient handlers to be notified upon receipt of selected event messages, see (FIG. 8, col. 14, lines 55-67 to col. 15, lines 1-4);

within the handlers, providing a set of rules to be evaluated, with each rule having a corresponding action to be executed; and

when an event message is received by a handler, evaluating a subset of rules, and executing any actions. Fisher does not explicitly disclose the rule evaluates True and rules that evaluate True. However, Fisher teaches the matching rule must apply to the "event notification" operation and the targeted grant rule for notification which means the only granted notification (notification passed against the deny rules evaluated as True, FIG. 5, col. 15, lines 13-27) can be forwarded to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Fisher include the step of the rule that evaluate to True. The "True" is to have granted right against deny rule, thus, the system provide access rights or privileges to specific applications. Therefore, it would be beneficial to use granted right for security and filtering the information.

With respect to claim 6, Fisher disclose that the action to a rule comprises sending a message to a user, see (FIG. 8, col. 14, lines 26-67 to col. 15, lines 1-57).

With respect to claim 7, Fisher discloses that the database having data which can be changed, see (col. 15, lines 42-57, Note: access control tree is one of the database in abstract); and

job that periodically examines the database, and generates an event message when selected data items in the database have changed from a pervious examination, see (col. 15, lines 42-57).

**Conclusion**

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kleinman (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,640) discloses the system for synchronization execution of a process on multiple independent event.

Ouchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,836) discloses the system for router manager for email message routing.

Artsy (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,484) discloses the system for routing an object.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

IMW  
September 12, 2002

  
**SHAHID AL ALAM**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**